DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 410 565 CS 215 884

AUTHOR Blackwell, Susan
TITLE The Dilemma of Standards-Driven Reform.
PUB DATE 1997-03-13
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (48th, Phoenix, AZ, March 12-15, 1997).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; *National Standards; *Public Education; *Teacher Competencies; Teacher Education; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Educational Issues; Moral Orientation

ABSTRACT

Today's climate of anxious expectation and critical blame for failing schools have led to numerous calls for change. Nearly every educational organization has developed its own set of standards for teaching and learning. The Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards are a prime example of expectations being established for certification and licensure of new teachers. Two issues relative to using these standards (or those of the National Council of Teachers of English) are that the development and use of high standards alone cannot address the neglect of teacher preparation, and generic principles or standards are empty unless disciplined by moral purpose and sensitivity. Teaching as an occupation cannot claim professional status and recognition solely on the basis of scientific knowledge. Standards devoid of moral purpose will not attract teachers to the profession, make sure they are well-trained for the challenges they will face in the classroom, or induce them to stay in the profession. INTASC has informed the work in Indiana to the degree that various task forces are now preparing a new licensing system that is performance based. Because INTASC's focus is assessment practices and accountability, universities are being required to redesign their preparation programs according to these standards to endure teaching competence. But what can be expected of teachers? The improvement of schooling cannot occur without stronger teachers, and although standards help codify what is expected, they cannot do the work for the public. (Statistics about teaching/teachers are included.) (NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 410 565

Dr. Susan Blackwell
Director, Secondary Education
Marian College
March 13, 1997
CCCC

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. Blackwell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

The Dilemma of Standards-Driven Reform

In the 1980s, numerous reports emerged about the teaching profession which, to say the least, suggested that schools were failing miserably. Some of these were more thoughtful than others and pointed to legitimate issues and problems facing schools. Various studies, like Ted Sizer's *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School* and John Goodlad's *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future*, provided a responsible analysis, calling for clarification of the purposes of schooling and radical reforms in curriculum. While the alarmist tendencies have been with us since formal public education began back in the 1800s, today's climate of anxious expectation and critical blame have led to numerous calls for change. Nearly every educational organization today has developed its own set of standards for teaching and learning, creating hundreds of new acronyms! Even the National Goals now include a statement about Teacher Education and Professional Development. Goal 4 says that by the year 2000, the nation's teaching force will have access to programs for the continued improvement of their professional skills and the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to instruct and prepare all American students for the next century.

Why have there been so many calls for reform? Primarily because for the history of the teaching profession, we have given little recognition to teachers, teaching, or teacher education while emphasizing the importance of education and schools. We have said education is important but we haven't really meant it. Goodlad in his book *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*,

CS 215884

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

suggests that making sure we have had **enough** teachers has taken precedence over making sure we had good ones.

Thus the call for changes in the preparation of teachers. Teacher education has been neglected but not ignored. It has been scrutinized, as Goodlad suggests, but generally misunderstood by those who direct it and certainly misunderstood by those who want to influence it. As a profession, we have not understood what it takes to attract, educate and retain able, committed people to teach our children. Simple prescriptions, and yes, even standards, have been the vehicle for addressing the problems of preparing new teachers. Yet, if the diagnoses behind previous prescriptions had been correct, then teacher education would be in much better health today. It is not. The same medicine has not remedied the problems. Today, the development of high standards is the new medicine. It remains to be seen whether or not this remedy will deal symptomatically or fundamentally with concerns we all have about the preparation of new teachers.

In this presentation, I would like to use the INTASC standards as a prime example of the expectations being established for certification and licensure of new teachers, and I would like to address two issues relative to using standards like these or even those prepared by NCTE to guide Teachers of English Language Arts. The first issue is that the development and use of high standards alone cannot address the neglect of teacher preparation. The second issue I take from Goodlad who says that generic principles or standards are empty unless disciplined by moral purpose and sensitivity. Teaching as an occupation cannot claim professional status and recognition solely on the basis of scientific knowledge. Standards devoid of moral purpose will not satisfy these three requirements: how to attract teachers to the profession, how to make sure

teachers are well-trained for the challenges they will face in the classroom, and how to induce teachers to stay in the profession.

What these statistics suggest is that American society has ignored the conditions of the profession and that, desperate to fill the need for bodies in classrooms, the profession has allowed unprepared individuals to enter. Add to this the constant national call to reform schools by someone AND anyone, and we begin to understand the enormous demands placed on unprepared teachers to compensate for the erosion of families, religious institutions, and communities. Schools have been asked to do more (actually all) of what everyone wants: from the state legislature which thinks all students need information on AIDS to the state board of education which believes that 250 minutes of week of instruction is essential to good schooling.

Let's look at the 10 INTASC principles, currently being used by Indiana and many other states to direct reform of teacher education. INTASC is the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium, a program of the Council of Chief State School Officers. These officers are the state superintendents of public instruction across the country. This project was designed to enhance collaboration among states interested in rethinking teacher assessment for initial licensing as well as for preparation and induction into the profession. INTASC has informed the work in Indiana to the degree that various task forces are now preparing a new licensing system that is performance based. Licenses will be issued at four developmental levels and the standards for each license, including the content areas will be very specific around three parts: knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Because the focus of INTASC is assessment practices and accountability, colleges and universities are being required to redesign their preparation programs according to these standards to ensure teaching competence.

There's no quibbling with these standards. They represent the best of what we know scientifically about what teachers should know and be able to do. Yet, this reform agenda arises out of two other agendas: the performance of school systems and success of individual schools. Let me give you some for instances.

Stats show we have an underachieving curriculum. For example, only 15 percent pursue advanced math classes and only 3 percent pursue a full calculus class. Our system lags a year behind that of other industrialized countries. Opportunity to learn is not even among students, schools, or countries.

How does adopting a goal of 90 percent graduation rate, as we have done in this country, push us to adopt a less demanding curriculum in order to achieve it?

Additionally, individual schools cannot compensate for what has been lost through changes in society. Schools cannot be everything to all constituencies.

Schools function in accord with a bizarre assumption that students should be ready for whatever custom dictates they should be ready for. The child in a school has become the victim for not mastering the work of first grade or second, or sophomore English, or Senior Comp. Even though the standards emphasize that teachers must understand the diversity of children, the psychology of development, as well as pedagogy that enhances each child's learning, schools are set up to manage all children as though they are the same.

Grouping children for reading, tracking children in high school English curriculum, using different curriculum for different groups of students -- all of these contribute to failure of the individual schools to achieve high learning. How do standards reconcile these structured realities with professional understanding of what children need to achieve? The comparative health of schools is largely determined by scores on standardized achievement tests.

This is as useful, as Goodlad says, as reading a thermometer to determine the health of a patient. A thermometer diagnoses fever, not heart disease or cancer. How do the standards reconcile the lack of guiding conception of the depth and breadth of knowledge that **students** should possess? How do standards reconcile the competing demands placed on schools and teachers? Right now, we have a shopping mall high school and an incredibly incoherent curriculum.

It is convenient to beat on teachers -- and to extoll higher preparation standards -- for school-based educational deficiencies. And, teachers must be held responsible for some. However, many of the demands placed on teachers clash with the wisdom they possess about how to deal with the school and classroom circumstances they face.

Now, back to the INTASC standards. These standards codify expectations clearly. The NCTE Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English Language Arts do too. Standards work well for assessment projects to ensure the best and brightest become teachers. But I fear that a standards approach to reforming the preparation of teachers will lead to superficial changes in assessment practices and make very little difference in the long run to lives of children. To prepare teachers to stay the course in schools, to contribute to the renewal of schools, standards fall miserably short. There are legacies embedded in 150 years of practice that make real reform in teacher education (and schools) so difficult (Goodlad). Lack of focus at most teacher education institutions, the ambivalent regard this country has for teachers, and the little attention on most campuses toward teacher education programs are all part of a legacy which work against the eventual success of the standards movement. Goodlad suggests that reformers engaged in the standards movement appear to be unaware of the complexity of the issues and problems facing educators (or that they are throwing up their hand grenades and hoping to

hit something). Even the NCTE Guidelines for Preparation of Teachers of English Language Arts does not address the link between renewal of schools and the preparation of new teachers except briefly in the continuing issues section of the document. And the standards-assessment approach, fostered by INTASC and others, is still only a piece of the puzzle, detached from the whole. It's a piecemeal rather than systemic approach. I believe that those who develop standards see them as the *beginning* of systemic change; **however**, without linking the renewal of teacher education (with all the appropriate standards) to the renewal of schools, we will have spent a great deal of time and money talking about the ideal yet never being able to achieve it.

The second issue I would like to address is that of moral imperative. We have to ask: What might we expect of our teachers? Goodlad says we might reasonably expect they be men and women we would comfortably entrust our children. They should be models of character and good conduct. They should be the best-educated citizens of the country with a broad background of knowledge and understanding. They should show good judgment and clear communication. If a teacher, Goodlad asks, is not a strong intellectual and moral force in the community, to whom do we turn? We must expect all teachers to believe that all children can learn. Teachers' purposes and beliefs, however, must be supported by pedagogical knowledge and skills. Teachers must be humble enough to try again and again differently. They must be able to make enlightened decisions hundreds of times a day in unpredictable classrooms. And they must be stewards of the schools in which they teach- concerned about all children, not just their own, and all the programs and structures.

"If public education is already exemplary and contains all the elements necessary to continuing renewalm we need look no further: we can mold the teacher education enterprise in the shape of the school-based enterprise. But

clearly this is not the case. Consequently we must be guidednot by what is with respects to schooling but what should be. Teacher education has much to do then, with normative matters pertaining to the nature of education and what one's conception of education means for the conduct of schooling in a democratic society" (Goodlad,48.)

I'd like to turn to four matters which Goodlad has suggested are critical:

1. Facilitating critical enculturation. Schools are major players in developing educated persons who acquire all kinds of understandings by which they judge their own and society's good and bad. Schools seek to ensure that individuals are humane.

2. Providing access to knowledge. School is the only institution in society specifically designed to provide youth with structured experiences with different subject areas.

3. Building an effective Teacher-Student Connection. The moral responsibility of educators is clearest in this arena. The relationship is so complex that it is ridiculous to suggest that someone will simply acquire the skills, knowledge, and dispositions necessary to make the relationship work. Mere exposure through coursework or even mentoring models is questionable. The generic principles can be applied to a host of situations yet embrace only a fraction of what teachers must know and be able to do. We must go far beyond the mechanics of teaching. Standards do not address well the sensivitiy needed to pervasive human qualities and potentials always involved and a full awareness of what it means to simultaneously draw out and enculturate.

4. Practicing good stewardship. Schools are terribly neglected places in their total ecology, Goodlad suggests. More is going to be required of teacher education programs in the future. We cannot prepare teachers for individual classrooms as though the rest of the institution did not exist. Teachers are the

primary stewards of schools and should be prepared to accept the responsibility. Standards rarely, if ever, address this aspect of teaching preparedness.

To conclude, it seems that standards, while needed to establish high expectations for all, are limited in what they probably will accomplish in the scheme of things. As Goodlad hints, unless the renewal of schools is linked with the preparation of beginning teachers, it remains likely that new teachers will either be swallowed into survival mode or become beacons in otherwise unengaged places. Unless there is a moral imperative that drives teachers and schools to develop habits of thinking and behaving in children (especially when the teachers and schools aren't looking), it remains likely that teachers will become stagnant in their expectations. Unless there is persistence to change, it remains likely that complacency with "this too shall pass" will consume even the newest of the profession.

The improvement of schooling cannot occur without stronger teachers. Standards help us codify what we expect. But they cannot do the work for us.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future

Too Few Teachers Have Adequate Preparation

* More than 12 % of all newly hired teachers enter the workforce without any training

* 15% enter without having fully met state standards

* Only 500 of the nation's 1200 education schools meet common professional standards

Too Many Current Teachers are Underqualified

* Less than 75% of all teachers have studied child development, learning and teaching methods, have degrees in their subject area, and have passed state licensing requirements

* Nearly 25% of all secondary teachers do not have even a college minor in their main teaching field (30 % in math)

* More than half the teachers teaching physical science have no background

* High-poverty school and low-track class statistics are worse

Number of Teachers Has Declined

* The proportion of school staff classified as classroom teachers has fallen from 70% in 1950 to 52% in 1993

* Teaching staff comprise only 43 % of total school employment. In other countries it varies from 60 to 80%

Teachers Have Too Little Time and Too Heavy a Workload

* Most elementary teachers have 8.3 minutes of prep time for every hour they teach

* High school teachers have 13 minutes

* Teaching loads for high school teachers generally exceed 100 students per day and reach nearly 200 per day in some cities

* Average class size is 24 with some areas having as many as 30 students per classroom

Too Few Resources Go Toward Teacher Development and Salaries

* School districts spend 1-3 % of their resources on teacher development

* Teachers earn substantially less than other professionals, including accountants, sales reps, and engineers

* Average salaries range from $20,354 in South Dakota to $43,326 in Connecticut

* Resources needed to make recommended reforms to the American school system constitute less than 1% of the amount spent for the federal savings and loan bailout

Implications for Research and Change

Focus on More Collaboration and Integration

Research on the Use of Standards to Promote Changes in Schools

***State-Level Changes in Teacher Ed Programs**

***State-Level Changes in Policy to Support Schools**

Inquiry by Teacher Education Faculty

***Studies Looking at the Relationship Among Standards, Assessment, and Competence**

***Studies Which Connect Faculty to Gritty Daily Life of Teachers**

Better Descriptions of What Teachers Know and Do to be Effective

***Studies Which Look Longitudinally at Teacher Development**

***Action-Research Studies by Classroom Teachers**

***Collaborative Study of Student Work Bringing Teacher Ed Faculty and Classroom Teachers Together**

From John Goodlad, *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*

Why reform is a moral imperative

What Educators Do

Facilitate Critical Enculturation

Provide Access to Knowledge

Build an Effective Teacher/Student Connection

Practice Good Stewardship